COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE
A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology

Thursday, September 15, 2011
10:00 AM - 11:30 AM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
1501 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Cisco webex

AUDIO PHONE NUMBER: 1-602-425-3192
AUDIO ACCESS CODE: 1112#

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT
Kip Anderson*	Cathy Clarich
Julie Dybas *(Randy Kennedy, proxy)*	
Mary Hawkins*	
Donald Jacobson	
Phillip Knox	
Patrick McGrath	
Richard McHattie	
Michael Malone	
Rona Newton	
Patricia Noland	
Michael Pollard, *Chair*	
Rick Rager	
Paul Thomas	

GUESTS	AOC STAFF
Steve Ballance*, *Pima Superior Court*	Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
John Barrett, *Maricopa Superior Court*	Melissa Hinojosa, *ITD*
Jennifer Gilbertson, *Phoenix Municipal Court*	Bob Macon, *ITD*
Lester Godsey, *City of Mesa*	Adele May, *ITD*
Melissa Knight*, *Pinal Superior Court*	Jim Price, *ITD*
Cindy McDonald*, *MCJC*	Renny Rapier, *ITD*
	Jim Scorza, *ITD*
	Cynthia Thomas, *ITD*

* **indicates appeared by telephone**

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTORY REMARKS
Judge Michael Pollard, Chair, called the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) meeting to order just after 10:00 a.m. After confirming that a quorum existed he requested members' input regarding the minutes from the August CACC meeting.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes of the August 18, 2011, CACC meeting as written. The motion passed unanimously.

EXPECTATIONS FOR MANAGERS OF MONITORED PROJECTS
The chair read a quote from a year ago about the overarching goal of the subcommittee's direction following the COT annual meeting and expressed his concern about continued lack of communication among project managers. He adjured members to avoid blaming and fact-finding about date changes and instead ensure that effective communication is occurring between managers of projects and managers of dependant projects whenever dates change for whatever reason.

Some members shared their concerns about the format of items used to capture the relationships between projects and the lack of context provided by staff for project managers' presentations in the meeting. Suggestions were made to separate critical dependencies from incidental dependencies somehow, to print the affected views of the MindMap for members each meeting, and to align the COT priority projects with the dependencies in a more linear fashion. Some project managers decried their lack of time to report on the status of their local projects that affect statewide initiatives and shared their perception that CACC expects them to somehow tackle statewide communication. Karl Heckart clarified that AOC project managers will continue to handle the statewide communications but require current information from local project managers to inform their communications. Local project managers also pointed out conflicts between their city or county priorities and COT's priorities – not all the priority projects can be accomplished simultaneously because resources overlap so greatly. Karl mentioned that he will request COT to further prioritize its top-tier projects in November and provide clearer direction to local project managers experiencing conflicts.

The chair then contrasted Pima Superior's approach to project communication and Maricopa Justice Courts' (MCJC) approach to project communications. John Barrett, Chief Technology Officer for Maricopa Superior Court, suggested that his Court Technology Services organization handle the reporting duties for MCJC now that Myron Pecora is engaged in the project. Jim Price confirmed that the project communication issues he described last month have improved this month.

PACC UPDATE
Rona Newton, PACC chair, briefly reported on the meeting held in August. PACC members' greatest frustration involves the lack of probation-related reports from AJACS. Rona has been directing inquiries about the reports to Pat McGrath.

REVIEW OF CHANGES TO MINDMAP THIS MONTH
Staff member Stewart Bruner reported on a series of project deliverable changes that reflect scope and release date changes from vendors. He deferred the details of those changes to the

project managers' specific presentations later in the meeting. Patti Noland and Rona Newton asked why vendors are not being held to negotiated dates and scopes. Karl Heckart explained how conditions and customer requirements change over time – sometimes clinging too tightly to the original specification will choke the business process and prevent implementation. Vendors are also experiencing their own resource challenges, just like the courts.

SPECIFIC PROJECT UPDATES

Renny Rapier, manager for the general jurisdiction (GJ) case management system (CMS) enhancements project, described to members slips in delivery dates for the interfaces necessary to support ADRS, JOLTSaz, and APETS due to their placement into later releases of AJACS than originally estimated.

Jim Price, AZTurboCourt Project Manager at the AOC, updated members on the situation with e-filing of small claims at MCJC. Enhancements beyond the August 12 TurboCourt release are needed for party matching and party role activities to support the court's auto-accept strategy. Various integration items are on hold, pending those application changes, but the court's OnBase implementation is continuing with only a minor slip. Data defects continue to be addressed at Pima Superior Court. On the criminal e-filing front, Jim and Karl described the high-level strategy of having the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission (whose policy committee Karl chairs) drive the business process flow and requirements setting. The criminal effort will likely take longer than originally planned due to the higher number of entities involved.

John Barrett added some detail about the MCJC OnBase implementation effort, development progress on Maricopa's SWID and AZYAS interfaces, as well as the current condition of the RFR replacement effort. The clerk's office will be taking the lead on development going forward while John's group remains a partner and system integrator. Rich McHattie explained that RFR replacement is not essential to e-filing and that Maricopa's Foundation project is the key priority and consumer of resources at the moment so the RFR replacement timeline will be extended.

Adele May, Limited Jurisdiction (LJ) CMS Project Manager at the AOC, described her date changes relative to the recently updated AmCad release schedule. She provided progress on some tasks tangential to the CMS project, like ADRS business training, creating documentation, Camtasia video library creation, and rolling out disconnected scanning to smaller LJ courts.

Paul Thomas, Court Administrator for Mesa, shared that AmCad's release changes will also affect the Mesa effort but are not a critical issue at this point. Lester Godsey from Mesa IT, the increasingly less interim project manager while the court restarts its recruitment process, reported that the timeline for business requirements has been extended considerably since last meeting, but the implementation date remains April 2013. Staff confirmed that the project plan is now firm enough that key milestones can appear in the MindMap. Jim Scorza described the effects expectation differences between GJ and LJ courts are having on the development timeline for the large volume enhancements. AmCad has agreed to make the fundamental changes for LJ courts, but those haven't been executed yet. Members agreed that the LJ Steering Committee needs to be re-engaged. In response to a question about justice court input to the Mesa project,

Paul shared that he had 12 years experience in justice court prior to coming to Mesa and that the project continues to reach out to PCCJC for input.

POST-IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS
No implementations were reported this month.

ITEMS OF OLD OR NEW BUSINESS
No items of old or new business were raised.

The next meeting will take place in **Room 106** of the **State Courts Building** on **October 20, 2011**.

The meeting adjourned at noon, following a motion by Don Jacobson to that effect.